DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 684 CS 204 339

AUTHOR Wright, Donald K.
TITLE Differential Effects of Professionalism and Social Responsibility in Public Relations.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (61st, Seattle, Washington, August 13-16, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; *Job Analysis; Job Satisfaction; Journalism; Occupational Information; *Professional Occupations; *Public Relations; Questionnaires; *Social Responsibility

ABSTRACT

Questionnaires were sent to 306 public relations counselors in Texas to discover if professionalism is a contributory cause of social responsibility in public relations, if the presence or absence of professionalism increases the likelihood that social responsibility will occur, and the conditions, if any, under which professionalism contributes to social responsibility in the performance of public relations services. The professional orientation levels of the 143 respondents were established by application of a 24-item professional-orientation index. A ten-item scale was used to obtain levels of social responsibility. Respondents were then classified into three categories (high, medium, and low) relating to their professional orientation, and into three similar categories regarding their social responsibility orientation. Results indicated that professionalism and social responsibility are not the same thing in public relations. It is possible to be a professional without being very socially responsible, and some socially responsible public relations people are not very professional. On the basis of the study, it is not possible to claim that one of these conditions is a contributing cause of the other. Indeed, professionalism and social responsibility are intangible concepts and are difficult to measure. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159684

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PUBLIC RELATIONS DIVISION

DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF PROFESSIONALISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN PUBLIC RELATIONS

by

Donald K. Wright

Henry W. Grady School of Journalism and Mass Communication

University of Georgia

Athens, Georgia 30602

(404) 542-4466

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donald K. Wright

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Presented to the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Annual Convention, Seattle, Washington August 14, 1978

CS214339

DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF PROFESSIONALISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN PUBLIC RELATIONS

Until the turn of this century the history of American commerce illustrated the fact that most companies existed only for the purpose of furthering their profits. The only regard showed toward consumers was whether or not they purchased goods and services. Then the writings of Tarbell, Sinclair, Steffens and others exposed bad sides of big business often producing violent public reactions.[1] Some trace the beginning of public relations, as we know it in America today, to this "era of the Muckrakers" when corporations sought communications advice to interpret their sides of the stories to the public. Specialists hired to carry out these corporate communication tasks often were New York journalists. Many of them went on to become the first of the modern day public relations practitioners. Most cared little about social responsibility, professionalism or ethics and used their influence and ability only to further corporate ends. These actions have much to do with the poor image public relations still is confronted with.

Sixty years later, when America's consumers and journalists exerted pressures on business and industry, the public relations function in most cases had been elevated to management-level status. The public relations practitioner was no longer the fly-by-night press agent of years gone by. The lush press junkets to extravagant locales had been replaced by communication campaigns designed to sell corporate images to stockholders. Public relations had a body of knowledge, a professional society, a code of ethics, a system for accreditation of practitioners by examination, a process for reporting violations including reviewing and censuring, a Foundation furthering public relations

research and education, specified curricula for study at the university-level and a system of accreditation for these programs teaching courses in PR. Granted there are problems in that one can still practice public relations without being accredited and non-accredited university sequences of PR outnumber the accredited programs five to one, but generally speaking in America today the public relations person is expected to be a professional---someone with ethics, morals and a strong sense of social responsibility.

Finn has said that the new role of public relations consultant is no longer primarily that of a communicator, but that of a moderator assisting clients to conduct their business "in a way that is responsive to the new demands made by concerned...segments of the community."[2] Hershman puts it this way: "Public relations, which for many executives used to be an ego trip or a way to jack up their stocks, is now a function concerned with corporate survival."[3]

Others share these views about the need for professionalism and concern for social responsibility in public relations. Sol Linowitz, former Chairman of the Board of the Xerox Corporation has said:

> To realize its full promise in the world of tomorrow, American business and industry...will have to make social goals as central to its decisions as economic goals; and leadership in our corporations will increasingly recognize this responsibility and accept it.[4]

Frank Wylie, Public Relations Director of the Chrysler Corporation and current President of the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) has told PR practitioners:

> You have few skills to offer and most of these can be duplicated by others. What then is the one skill-ability which you alone possess? It's your ethics. It's your credibility. It's proof of all the statements you've made and of all the promises you've given that sets you apart from others. I know of nothing more vital to communication than the reputation of honesty, and the actions of an ethical person.[5]

Still the role of public relations frequently is viewed with misconception, if not total ignorance. Public relations practitioners often are regarded as troubleshooters; as slick salesmen called in to resolve problems only after things have gotten out of hand. Many view today's public relations person as nothing better than yesterday's publicity agent claiming this person is responsible for glossing over mistakes and errors; for concealing the negative and displaying only the positive.

Newsom has said that public relations people will be appreciated best when they measure up to the demands made on them, "when the White House would no more hire someone other than a public relations professional as Press Secretary at the Cabinet level than it would hire a witch doctor as Surgeon General of the United States."[6]

Today, more than ever before, the communications industry has become a tremendously important factor in American society. As Corson and Steiner assert, "American business enterprises---from the self-employed appliance repairman to the billion-dollar corporation---are being held responsible for their performance in a more precise and thorough fashion than ever has occurred."[7] Americans who depend on their communication networks for information have grown intolerant of anything short of complete openness and honesty on all issues. Thus, public relations practitioners in their roles of creating corporate communication are expected to exercise a strong sense of professionalism and social responsibility in all their activities which affect the public directly or indirectly.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This paper examines the relationship between "professionalism" and "social responsibility" in American public relations. There is little empirical

research on either of these concepts as they apply to PR, but methodological measuring instruments constructed for communicator analysis research in other areas of mass communication can be modified to gauge levels of orientation towards these factors for our purposes.

Social responsibility factors always are considered in studies measuring professional orientation, and there are indications that professional status is one component in the model defining true social responsibility in public relations. Our concern in the case at hand is whether or not an empirical study can assert that professionalism is one of the factors that determine social responsibility. Is professionalism a contributory cause of social responsibility? Does the presence or absence of professionalism increase the likelihood that social responsibility will occur? What are the conditions, if any, under which professionalism contributes to social responsibility in the performance of public relations services?

OVERVIEW OF PROFESSIONALISM

In today's modern age of sophistication and specialization many occupations which have not already done so contend for acceptance from society by seeking recognition as "professions." Some say the development and increasing strategic importance of the professions probably constitutes the most important change that has occurred in the occupational system of modern societies.[8] Growth of professions in America has brought to prominence a set of occupations which never figured prominently in the ideological thinking.[9]

In the strictest sense of the term, a profession has been defined as a high-status occupation composed of highly trained experts performing a very specialized role in society. To specify any occupational group as a profession or a non-profession invites controversy, according to Cogan, who claims interpretations of professional definition are either "polarized toward an

enthusiastic and uncritical acceptance or toward a rancorous and defensive rejection."[10]

The list of those who have established criteria to dinstinguish professions from occupations is long.[11] There is consensus, however, that the following characteristics are essential to a profession: intellectual techniques, code of ethics, comprehensive self-governing organization, greater emphasis on service to society than on private economic gain, performance of a unique and essential service, based on a substantial body of knowledge, having a broad range of autonomy, and having practitioners who are guided by altruism.

These criteria define the "traditional, true or learned professions." In earlier times these were law, religion and medicine, but the superciliousness of our modern social structure has made "professionals" out of all who do more or less reliably what they say they will do and get paid for it.[12] Some still hold to firm historical and lexicological levels of definition claiming only medical doctors, lawyers and members of the clergy have the right to be considered professionals today,[13] others have carried this debate to exorbitant extremes saying people could be professionals in terms of many definitions if they were to profess, by means of media advertising, to walk your dog. These dog walkers' rights to be called professionals would increase if they belonged to a group of dog-walkers who assume collective responsibility for seeing that the dogs are tended to.[14] Consequently there is no general agreement either on any authoritative statement as to which occupations are professions or on any list of requirements necessary for any occupation to be classified as a profession.[15]

The purpose in this paper is not to determine whether public relations is a profession or not. Such a decision would be merely an interpretation of aforementioned criteria and definitions. One could argue with some justification that PR is a profession and that it is not. Although public relations has

many elements and characteristics of professions it still lacks some important ingredients of the traditional professions. And yet, the importance of public relations practitioners in information dissemination puts many PR people in positions of high responsibility as communication becomes more essential to American society year after year.

This paper suggests that the question of whether any occupational group is a profession or not should be asked in terms of individual practitioners and not of occupational practices themselves. This introduces the concept of professionalism---or professionalization as some have called it---which is the tendency of any occupational group to take on the characteristics of a profession, and the process by which this occurs. This is to argue, perhaps, that there are professional PR people just as there are professional lawyers and physicians, but that there are unprofessional medical doctors and attorneys just as there are unprofessional PR practitioners.

There are professionalism measurement tools which mass communication researchers have used to examine those who work as communicators. Most of this research, however, has concentrated on newspaper and broadcast media journalists and public relations practitioners often have been overlooked as subjects in these communicator analysis studies.

McKee, Nayman and Lattimore applied this technique in a survey of Colorado public relations counselors.[16] They found evidence that PR is moving closer toward being a profession, mainly because of a large number of public relations personnel who "see themselves as professionals and strive for professional performance."[17] These results were compared with findings of a separate survey of Colorado newspaper journalists in a later report.[18] One could interpret this comparison favorably for public relations since the study found PR people more satisfied with their jobs, more educated and with more professional

scores on most of the professionalism items in the two surveys.[19] But despite a significantly lower degree of job satisfaction, journalists seemed reluctant to move into public relations unless such a move was made to improve "their financial well being." Thus the stigma of unrespectability which has plagued public relations since earliest times apparently still exists in the eyes of America's journalists.

Grunig's survey of public relations counselors in the Baltimore-Washington area used four scales to measure "professionalization" as part of a more comprehensive analysis of public relations procedures.[20] Professionalization findings revealed few PR practitioners who could be classified as "professionals" as defined by these scales. Grunig found the average PR counselor has a bachelors degree and some basic PR training, but that few have advanced degrees and training in public relations. Also, most subjects in this study were not even members of PRSA, much less accredited members, shedding light on the argument that all who want to consider themselves public relations practitioners are able to do so.

Aside from empirical research on the question of professionalism in public relations, many have used qualitative assessments and written comments about the state of PR in professional terms.

Lesly says these five factors "have retarded the maturity of public relations as a profession": (1) the presence of many unqualified people---often with unsound motives---calling themselves PR specialists: (2) the specialized nature of PR is not understood by the American public; (3) the "stubbornly distorted and prejudiced" way many American journalists view public relations with resentment; (4) even the best public relations service is often intangible and comparatively immeasurable; and (5) there is a lack of enforcement of professional standards by PR practitioners themselves.[21]

Cutlip and Center give public relations credit for making great advances in professionalism in the past seventy years but say PR "still has a considerable distance to go before it matures into a profession."[22] Moore and Canfield say public relations has developed in a manner to at least suggest professional status.[23] Newsom and Scott stress the importance of ethics in PR and the importance of honesty in communication.[24]

Steinberg says that public relations does not have professional status in any way, explaining that no license is required to practice and "anyone can call himself a 'public relations counsel'."[25]

Perhaps PRSA membership and accreditation programs, accreditation for university-based sequences in public relations, and other developments of the past twenty years have stimulated interest for individual public relations people to become more professionalized. Even though Golden might be correct in saying there are no more frauds in public relations than in any other line of work,[26] the fact that anyone who wants to be a public relations counselor in America can do so without this education, accreditation, professional association, and so on, rules out any substance to the argument that public relations is a profession in the United States today.

Public relations counselors can't even decide if they want professional status. Some feel professional status would require licensing and those who perceive of the PR role as purely informational feel public relations' insistence on licensing would not hold water because such regulation would violate First Amendment rights of those not licensed. Ranney argues that striving for professional status is self-serving and could "stultify the creative thought" necessary for success in public relations. He says professional status doesn't exist in any occupational group despite acronyms such as CLU, CPA, MD, DDS, "and of course, APR."[27] Ranney contends "that

practitioners in every calling represent a very wide range of competence." Fenton, on the other hand, calls for the establishing of professional guidelines in public relations, "to differentiate between the public relations professional, the publicist, the press agent, the public information officer or the public affairs manager."[28] She says PRSA should set standards for education and performance in public relations.

This paper argues that, because of its uniqueness, public relations should not be examined as a "profession" or a "non-profession," but that the question of whether or not PR is professional should be asked in terms of the individual and not the practice. Therefore, this study examines individual public relations counselors and places them on a continuum in accordance with their self-images of the basic criteria of professionalism. Our interest here is how subjects picture themselves on this continuum.

OVERVIEW OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The concern for social responsibility places many moral and ethical restrictions upon institutions and organizations by insisting that Americans always act and perform their duties in a socially responsible manner. As Cutlip and Center explain it, public relations ultimately must be judged on the basis of its social utility and since PR now occupies an important role in society it is viewed with close public scrutiny.[29] Some feel this obligation of social concern, which presupposes honesty, truth, accuracy, fair dealing and concern for the public's welfare, has been placed on communications in general and specifically on the communicators themselves.[30]

Perhaps it is best to examine the need for social responsibility in public relations by looking first at the role of business and ethics in the United States. Benson says the ethical climate in America is not really

conducive to widespread principled behavior. This statement is justified, Benson says, because the U.S. has a higher rate of crimes of violence and higher proportionate rates of political corruption than any other industrialized nation.[31]

The American public does not hold business in high esteem. Opinion Research Corporation surveys now tell us that seventy percent of all Americans believe business has an obligation to help society even if it means making less profit, and sixty-five percent of the American public thinks businesses do everything they can to make a profit even if it means ignoring the public's needs.[32] Only forty-two percent think business today has a social conscience---i.e., that it is motivated by more than profit.

Simon cites two schools of thought when discussing social responsibility in a public relations framework.[33] The first is Friedman's philosophy saying the only responsibility American businesses have is to make profits. The second is the report of the Committee for Economic Development (CED) on "Social Responsibilities of Business Corporation," which ascertains that the public believes American businesses have moral obligations to assist with social progress even at the expense of profitability.

Friedman's view, although considered extreme by many, insists businesses are responsible only to those who own them:

> In a free-enterprise, private property system, a corporate executive is an employee of the owners of the business. He has direct responsibility to his employers. That responsibility is to conduct the business in accordance with their desires, which generally will be to make as much money as possible while conforming to the basic rules of society, both those embodied in law and those embodied in ethical custom.[34]

According to Friedman, when big business participates in socially responsible activities it becomes active in only those activities business wishes to participate in. Among other examples, Friedman cites Henry Ford's

so called social responsibility programs which had evidence---in Friedman's eyes at least---of anti-Semiticism.[35]

Somewhere in between Friedman and the CED report are John Maynard Keynes and John Kenneth Galbraith. Keynes argued, in 1936, that America had arrived at an equilibrium with substantial unemployment saying the free enterprise system had balanced out with 16 million unemployed people, and those who were employed should be taxed so the government could care for those not working.[36] Galbraith challenged this view by pointing out it failed to solve many of America's social problems.[37]

The CED report says social responsibility should prevail, to some extent, over net profitability:

> The fact is that the public wants business to contribute a good deal more (more than cheaper goods, more than less pollution, and more than better jobs) to achieving the goals of a good society...Business enterprises, in effect, are being asked to contribute more to the quality of American life than just supplying quantities of goods and services.[38]

What this means, according to Moore and Canfield, is that today's public relations person must be "a far cry from the old newspaperman-turned-public relations man whose only responsibility was to knock out a couple of press releases and then try to get some stories placed."[39]

As Simon explains, the social responsibility functions of most public relations practitioners depend on management or client philosophy.[40] On projects where Friedman's view of social responsibility prevails, the PR role is simply to assist management (or clients) to maximize profits. When the CED position is followed, the PR counselor usually must operate with the best interests of society in mind.

Votow points out that the array of definitions and conceptions with which this subject of "social responsibility" is burdened lead to many differing perceptions and social responsibility consequently is seen as an imposition,

an opportunity, an act of charity, a liability, a subterfuge, an excuse, an ideology, a search for respectability, a means of communication between system and subsystem, and, more to the point, "an exercise in public relations."[41]

This paper considers social responsibility to be a social norm which holds that any social institution, including the smallest family unit and the largest corporation, is responsible for the behavior of its members and may be held accountable for their misdeeds. Public relations people, in other words, should act at all times with the best interests of society in mind.

Empirical research on social responsibility and public relations is minimal. Indeed, one purpose of this paper is to stimulate thought and discussion about additional research in this area. One study found that the level of social responsibility in public relations rises as professionalization takes place and the level of respect from management increases, the degree of supervision from management decreases and as the public relations counselor's role in the decision making process becomes more dominant.[42] This suggests that social responsibility goes hand-in-hand with true professional status.

Although research on social responsibility per se is lacking there is considerable writing about topics such as ethics and communicator credibility in the literature of public relations. Finn, echoes one view expressed in the empirical research on social responsibility, saying that PR people often want to be more ethical than their clients (or management) will permit them to be.[43] Aronoff's research about communicator credibility suggests that since PR people are not respected by journalists these news media personnel form attitudes with preconceived notions that public relations counseling has a negative effect on society.[44] One need only examine the attitudes and opinions of many U.S. journalism professors toward public relations to find

emergence of abundant negative feelings about PR. Even though many news-editorial majors in journalism schools eventually wind up working in PR, many of these people form solid negative opinions about the value of public relations during their years in journalism school.

One might be correct in suggesting that since journalists are the "gatekeepers" for much of the information disseminated to American society, these negative attitudes some journalists hold about public relations counselors have much to do with the negative impression many Americans have of PR today.

What society does not understand is that often it hears only negative stories about public relations from journalists and only positive stories about journalists from the news media. For instance, few Americans hold PR in high enough esteem to consider it one of the more ethical, honest, moral or professional occupational groups in our society. However, at the same time, one wonders how many of these people who distrust public relations know that, as Wylie's research claims, journalists often ask PR people for special favors such as the following: employment for sons and daughters of news personnel; free tickets for entertainment purposes; use of automobiles for vacations; free repairs of products owned by journalists; flat-rate fees for reworking news releases "to make them more acceptable"; use of company airplanes to take journalists and their families to vacation spots, and use of hotel rooms with companies picking up the tab.[45] As this study found, more than sixty percent of the PR people asked to provide such favors felt they had better comply with the requests or else pay for it in terms of poor media relations.

In order to compare social responsibility with professionalism in this study, social responsibility also will be viewed in terms of individual

practitioners. Without attempting to say whether public relations is socially responsible or not, this paper examines PR counselors in view of their self-images of basic criteria of socially responsible factors. These include social responsibility orientation, PR's role in decision making, status of the PR function in the organization, level or respect from management, the relative degree of supervision, and the level of professional orientation.

COMPARING PROFESSIONALISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The relationship between professionalism and social responsibility is interesting. Since professional criteria include a concern for altruism and stipulate service to society, one might argue that someone must be socially responsible in order to be a professional. However, in our capitalistic society it is an accepted fact that financial renumeration for professional services is essential.

In the strictest lexicographical sense one might claim a medical doctor is not a professional if in his office there is a sign indicating that patients are expected to pay for services the day they receive them. A lawyer interested in representing a plaintiff in a $3 million lawsuit might be more interested in the potential of his own economic gain than in the client's position or on the effect the case might have on society, but most would still consider this attorney to be a professional.

Professional criteria are diverse and it's possible that each society places differing degrees of emphasis upon these requirements. One might find, for example, that a professional group in a socialistic country might have neither a high level of autonomy nor a strong concern for individual economic gain. That same professional group in the United States might be very concerned about personal financial renumeration but have a broad range of professional autonomy.

And what is socially responsible? Ten years ago Americans might have considered it socially responsible to ban protests about the Vietnam war. Today most would consider such banning an infringement on freedom. In a political system other than our own, Richard Nixon might have been able to squelch those he knew were doing him in and have done so with the best interests of society in mind. Americans hold freedom and free enterprise in exceptionally high esteem. This is echoed when journalists like Carl Rowan, who is black, write syndicated newspaper columns arguing that the American Nazi Party has rights too.[46] Rowan, who says Nazis are "despicable," argues that actions denying these Naxis their First Amendment freedoms "are more dangerous than the Naxis themselves."

Yet along with the argument that one must be socially responsible to be professional comes evidence from previous research saying full professional status is one of four factors contributing to effective social responsibility in public relations communication campaigns.[47] Does this mean someone must be a professional to be considered socially responsible?

To illustrate this further one could examine the role of ethics in public relations. Is this part of professionalism, or social responsibility, or both? We could debate the answer to this question many ways. Culberson says PR people are more concerned with their own ethics as the result of PRSA judiciary processes,[48] but Jeffers and Aronoff indicate PR people think they're more ethical than outsiders do.[49]

Just as the intangible nature of public relations itself prohibits scientific measurement of its effectiveness much of the time, it might be impossible to eliminate factors of social responsibility in a scale measuring professionalism and, on the other hand, it might be impossible not to consider professionalism factors in an attempt to measure social responsibility.

One could, however, isolate factors which measure professional orientations, and those which measure social responsibility attributes and examine similar and differential effects of these concepts. That's what this study does.

METHODOLOGY

The population included all members of the Houston chapter of the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) and everyone on the roster of the Texas Public Relations Association (TPRA). Care was taken to remove from the TPRA mailing list names of Houston PRSA chapter members. Questionnaires were mailed to each potential subject (n=306) and 143 usuable responses were returned. Thus, a 46.7% return ratio was obtained.

Professional orientation levels of respondents were established by application of a 24-item professional-orientation index. This measuring tool was developed at the University of Wisconsin Mass Communication Research Center.[50] Minor revisions were made for the study in a public relations context. The measuring formula used 12 "professional" items and 12 "non-professional" items to obtain professional orientation scores.

Some social responsibility items are part of the professionalism measurement tool. Rather than risk the chance of obstructing this research device, which is the principal instrument for analysis of professionalism among communicators, these two social responsibility items were left intact and considered part of the professionalism tool. However, these items together with eight other factors were used in a 10-item scale to obtain levels of social responsibility orientation.

Respondents were then classified into three categories relating to their professional orientation and into three separate categories regarding their social responsibility orientation. Out of 143 subjects, 34.9% (or 50) were

classified as high professionals (HP); 32.3% (or 46) were considered as medium professionals (MP); and 32.9% (or 47) were designated as low professionals (LP). In terms of social responsibility measurement, 29.4% (or 42) fell into the high social responsibility category (HiSR); 37.1% (or 53) were in the medium social responsibility range (MdSR); and 33.5% (or 48) were ranked as low in social responsibility (LoSR).

Data were then subjected to an analysis in order to determine the probability of the relationship between various levels of professionalism and social responsibility.

RESULTS

Standard analysis of communicator studies measures the perceived difference between the level of desire for particular job characteristics and the level of actual provision by a subject's present job. In other words each respondent is asked to rate the importance of certain occupational attributes for any job on a seven-step scale ranging from "extremely unimportant" to "extremely important." First, the 24 professional orientation items, then the 10 social responsibility items, were rated in terms of their importance to what respondents considered the "ideal job in public relations." Next, subjects indicated how well their present positions in PR provide for each of these characteristics on a seven-step scale ranging from "extremely poorly" to "extremely well." Then the difference between the two sets of scores indicates the relative degree of satisfaction with the present job.

Differences between items measuring professional orientation are shown in Table 1 while Table 2 shows the variation between social responsibility orientation characteristics. In these comparisons high positive figures indicate dissatisfaction with what present jobs provide. On the other hand, negative figures reveal a relative satisfaction with the job.

Respondents appear relatively satisfied with the factors concerning having jobs which are valuable and essential to the community and working with well known and respected organizations and are satisfied---although to a lesser degree---with their potential to influence public opinion, the degree of supervision they receive and the fact that their presence appears to make the organization they work for different because they're there. Some satisfaction on the social responsibility orientation index was reported with the supervision factor and with the potential for socially responsible behavior at the present jobs.

While Tables 1 and 2 indicate moderate levels of frustration these differences between expected desires and actual provisions are compounded in crosstabulation analysis where one finds that many subjects rated professional and social responsibility items "extremely important," but few feel their present jobs provide these attributes "extremely well." For example, 63.6% of the total response group thinks "full use of abilities and training" are "extremely important," but only 19.1% indicate their present jobs provide this in "extremely well" manners.

As far as mean comparisons were concerned HP's were more satisfied than HiSR's on all "professional" items, and these HP's were more satisfied on all but two of the social responsibility orientation measures. However, further analysis here finds more individual HiSR's expect more from public relations employment than HP's do. For example, more HiSR's answered "extremely important" than MdSR's or LoSR's on all items. There were two cases when HP's did not consider issues as important as MP's or LP's. These involved "having a boss who appreciates what you do," and the freedom from close supervision factor. For both HP's and HiSR's the most negative measure of idealism regarded "having a job that is valuable and essential to society."

LP's and LoSR's placed great importance in "non-professional" items especially getting ahead in the organization, job security, salary, having a job with excitement and variety and having a job which doesn't disrupt family life. MP's considered decision making and status in the organization most important.

Of the social responsibility orientation items greatest agreement was that honesty and ethics are essential at all times in the practice of public relations. More than 70% of all the respondents considered these qualities "extremely important" including 75.5% of the HP's and 85.4% of the HiSR's.

Present Job Satisfaction. To measure attitudes about the actual public relations job which were not recordable in any other way the present-job satisfaction index was designed.[51] Respondents rated 12 items on a seven-point scale ranging from "extremely unsatisfied" to "extremely satisfied." Results displayed in Tables 3 and 4 suggest relative satisfaction with public relations as a line of work, but show no great differences between the six categories of orientation. Of all these 12 characteristics most satisfactory indications were received to how families feel about subjects working in PR, for the perceptions of the prospects for the future in PR and with satisfaction towards public relations as a line of work. All are least satisfied with their annual incomes.

Professional Implementation. As employees gain more professionalism and social responsibility they upgrade their occupational groups in line with the more traditional professions. The professionalization implementation index measures subjects' opinions on nine items regarding areas such as ethics, professional training, social and professional responsibility and professional licensing and regulation. Seven answers were possible ranging from "disagree extremely strongly" to "agree extremely strongly."

Subjects insisted that refresher courses were needed for professionals

to "brush up on subjects such as public opinion, management, contemporary PR problems, etc.," and they also felt strongly that universities should teach courses in public relations, that business majors should take these PR courses and that public relations majors should take classes in the business schools.

There was considerable uncertainty about two items on this index; one asking whether or not PRSA accreditation is raising the level of professionalism in PR, and the other calling for licensing for public relations "in a manner similar to other professions."

Testing for Hypothesis. For theoretical purposes, it was a contention of this study that professionalism was a contributory cause of social responsibility. Furthermore, it was predicted that respondents of any particular level of professional orientation would have a similar level of social responsibility orientation. In other words, HP's would be HiSR's, MP's would be MdSR's and LP's would be LoSR's.

Results indicate this hypothesis is not tenable. As Table 7 indicates only 10.4% were both HP and HiSR, only 8.4% were both MP and MdSR and just 9.8% were LP and LoSR. This means that 33.3% of the HP's were HiSR's; 38.3% of the MP's were MdSR's and 33.6% of the LP's were LoSR's.

According to these results it is possible to be a high professional without being high in social responsibility and it is possible to have plenty of social responsibility orientation while being low in professionalism. In the case at hand HP's were more likely to be LoSR's than HiSR's and the majority of HiSR's are MP's.

It's significant to point out that analysis indicates a considerable distribution between all levels of the two major concepts examined here. Although the hypothesis is not sustained, data tell us much about the differences between how professionalism and social responsibility are perceived by those who practice public relations.

Demographic Characteristics. The profile of the average public relations counselor, based on this study's respondents, is someone 41 years old who worked four years in the news media before entering PR about 14 years ago and has been with the same employer for the last eight years.

In terms of job titles, 14% were vice-presidents, 28.7% were PR directors, 16.8% were PR managers, 11.9% were PR coordinators, 5.6% were PR assistants, 3.5% were account executives and 19.6% had titles in the miscellaneous category. Most of the respondents (47.2%) worked with corporations while 19.8% were with public relations/advertising agencies, 18.6% were with institutions, 7.7% claimed to work in business and 7% were with associations.

Most (49%) were educated in mass communication and have university degrees in "journalism, communication, etc." Graduate degrees (M.A., M.BA., etc.) were claimed by 18.9%, university-level undergraduate degrees in fields other than communication were claimed by 16.8% while the remaining 15.3% had some college courses, some junior college study or high school graduation.

Salaries ranged from more than $50,000 to less than $8,000. Only 4.3% claimed to make more than $50,000 while 12% said they earned between $35,001 and $50,000; 26.8% indicated their salaries range from $25,001 to $35,000; 19.7% earn from $20,001 to $25,000; 9.2% make between $16,001 and $20,000; 14.8% earn between $12,001 and $16,000, while 12.7% make $12,000 or less.

Practitioners accredited by PRSA comprised 31.5% of the respondents, 37.1% were associate or active members of PRSA, 2.8% were pre-associate members and 28.7% did not belong to PRSA.

The majority (60.6%) list job appeal as the main reason for entering public relations as a line of work with 16.2% saying job security was the reason; 12.7% indicating the opportunity for advancement and 10.6% answering salary. Many (44.1%) describe their entry into public relations by explaining

that they worked in the news media and then entered PR, 29.4% claim to have studied and trained specifically for a PR career while 10.5% worked "elsewhere in the organization" and were then "moved into PR."

Subjects appear pleased with PR as an occupation as 80.3% insist they are not now looking for another job and the majority (54.6%) anticipate remaining in public relations for the rest of their working days. Some 24.8% expect to stay in PR for "at least ten more years," 11.3% plan to be in PR for from five to ten more years and only 9.2% anticipate leaving public relations for other occupations within the next five years.

Given the chance to start their professional careers over again, 77% would enter public relations, 12.6% are "uncertain" whether they would enter PR again or not, 9.8% said they "probably would not" enter PR if they had the choice to make again and only one subject said he "never" would enter public relations work if he had his life to live over.

Demographic Differences. Analysis of the six categories reveal differences at all levels. HP's and HiSR's are older than others, have worked more years in PR and, in most cases, have been at their present jobs longer. Those with most of the news media experience are high on the professional orientation scale but very low on the social responsibility orientation measure. Most corporate respondents were LP's and MdSR's, the typical business subject here was HP and MdSR, those with public relations/advertising firms and agencies were high level MP's and low level HP's but ranked high in social responsibility. Institution subjects generally were MP and HiSR while association respondents were HP and MdSR to HiSR.

Of the 143 subjects who returned usable questionnaires only 15 (or 10.5%) were both HP's and HiSR's. Further comparison of those high in both categories measured in the study finds they average 4.5 more years working experience in

PR than the norm, that most of them have been at their present jobs longer, and generally they have about one year less media experience than others surveyed. As one might assume, most of these people are very satisfied with their present jobs, have few plans to seek employment elsewhere, support PR education, PRSA accreditation and other items of professionalism. There is considerable evidence that these PR people are frustrated because elements they consider essential for the ideal PR job are not provided for very well in their actual positions. All but two of those in this combined category are male; 86.7% of these HP's and HiSR's are members of PRSA; 53.8% of those PRSA members are "accredited." Furthermore, this combined category is composed of PR counselors who, for the most part, earn salaries in the $25,001 to $35,000 range. Only 13.4% of this group reported earning salaries less than $20,000 and just 6.7% claimed to make more than $50,000. Eighty percent of these people had either graduate degrees from universities or university degrees in "journalism, communication, etc." The breakdown of the total included 33.3% with grad diplomas and 46.7% with "communication" degrees. This category recorded very high scores in favoring some form of disciplinary action---controlled by peers---for PR people who "act in an unprofessional manner." However, the suggestion that public relations counselors should be "licensed," which was agreed upon by the majority of these HP's and HiSR's, was not supported by as significant a percentage of these respondents. Only twenty percent of those in this category disagreed with the suggestion that PRSA's accreditation program was raising the level of professionalism in public relations.

Job Responsibilities. The questionnaire also sought information about the kinds of duties public relations people perform. More respondents in this study perform writing tasks than any other duties as 78.1% said they

write press releases and 77.4% indicated they were involved in "other kinds of writing." There were 45.3% writing speeches, 65.8% whose duties included "contacting journalists," 72.6% spend some of their time "counseling management," and about half of those who responded edit or work on company publications, are involved in customer/stockholder relations, and participate in employee relation communication.

In terms of the percentage of time these PR counselors devote to the tasks they perform, results indicate the typical respondent in this survey spends 9.8% of the work week writing press releases, 2.9% writing speeches, 12.2% performing "other kinds of writing tasks," 10.8% editing publications, 8.1% staging events, 8.4% contacting journalists, 3.9% preparing audio-visual material, 3.2% contacting government officials, 1.0% supervising a specialized staff, 8.5% working on customer and stockholder relations, 4.3% preparing institutional advertising, 1.5% conducting research, 12.7% counseling management about public relations, and 2.9% involved with "other" tasks.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

This study finds that professionalism and social responsibility are not the same thing in public relations. Data indicate it's possible to be a professional without being very socially responsible and evidence shows some socially responsible PR people are not very professional. On the basis of the examination reported on here it is not possible to claim that one of these conditions is a contributory cause of the other.

Indeed professionalism and social responsibility are intangible concepts and are difficult to measure. This research study employed methodology perfected for gauging various levels of professional orientation and measured social responsibility by using a similar technique with questions formulated after careful study of prior research in this field. It was assumed that

levels of professional orientation would parallel levels of social responsibility orientation but such was not so in two-thirds of the cases this study examined. Those who rated high on the professionalism measures were classified at all levels of social responsibility and the reverse was true also. Based on results of this survey the hypothesis which says that the presence of professionalism in public relations counselors increases the likelihood that social responsibility will occur can not be sustained.

The findings show that public relations practitioners vary greatly in levels of professionalism and in degrees of social responsibility orientation. Few---10.5% of those who responded in this survey---are high professionals with great concerns for social responsibility, but a relatively equal number are at the other extreme. What exists then, for the most part---i.e., about 80% of the cases examined here---is evidence of many public relations counselors who are at neither high nor low levels of orientation in terms of the combination of professionalism and social responsibility factors.

Although this study does not sustain its hypothesis the research is valuable in that it proceeds to characterize concepts about which little is known. Kaplan says research is meaningful when it transforms what was previously thought, clarifies it, and provides new meaning.[52] Findings here lead to insights which will be valuable in future research measuring professionalism and social responsibility in public relations. Indeed one purpose of this paper is to stimulate and encourage additional study in these areas.

All indications show that respondents in this study are relatively satisfied with public relations as a line of work and are pleased with their present jobs in PR. However, findings also indicate great frustrations for many public relations counselors because their actual jobs do not provide the levels of professional and social responsibility they expect. In other words,

many of those surveyed here want to be more professional and more socially responsible than their persent jobs permit them to be. This is not a new observation. Previous research on social responsibility in PR found that practitioners often can not perform the way they wish to act because management (or clients) insist they do otherwise.[53] As this study shows once again some public relations people want to be honest and ethical "at all times," but circumstances beyond their own control do not always permit them to act in such a manner.

This study also finds evidence of people working in PR who trained specifically for public relations careers at university-based PR sequences. Less than half of the respondents used employment with the news media as their entry routes into public relations.

In terms of professional criteria the majority surveyed here do not feel that public relations provides a "unique and essential service," but they agree, up to a point, that there should be some form of regulation by peers, that education for PR is a good thing, that altruism is important. But PR lacks a broad range of autonomy, is without a "comprehensive" self-governing program and a code of ethics all who practice PR must obey.

It's impossible to claim with any justification that public relations is a profession today when examining how it is practiced in the United States. And not all those practicing public relations are as socially responsible as they should be either. The abstract nature of the two concepts examined in this paper---and, indeed, of public relations itself---has led to differences in interpreting where PR stands in terms of professionalism and social responsibility. Some, such as Seifert, contend that public relations people are "professionals" who function in "the court of public opinion," which has been called the "highest court anywhere."[54] Others, including Cutlip, say

public relations is not a profession but an "occupational group" which functions in a "public opinion arena."[55] This notion is based on the contention that it's incorrect to assume there is a "court" of public opinion in America in the legal sense of that term because in public relations there is no guarantee that both sides of the issue will be heard.

Although one would have difficulty saying public relations is a profession, or that it is socially responsible most of the time on the bases of information gathered in this study, evidence was found to indicate that there are some public relations counselors who are very professional and hold social responsibility in high esteem.

TABLE 1

PERCEIVED PR JOB SATISFACTION ACCORDING TO PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION

	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF ACTUAL-IDEAL PR JOBS			
PROFESSIONAL ITEMS	HP (n=50)	MP (n=46)	LP (n=47)	TOTAL (n=143)
Full use of abilities and training	1.00	1.17	1.06	1.08
Opportunity for originality and initiative	0.54	0.87	0.78	0.73
Opportunity to learn new skills and knowledge	0.58	0.91	0.66	0.71
Getting ahead in your professional career	0.84	1.28	1.36	1.15
Working with a well known and respected organization	-0.22	-0.41	-0.36	-0.33
Having a job that's valuable and essential to the community	0.08	0.09	-0.30	-0.04
Respect for co-worker ability and competence	0.20	0.63	0.53	0.45
Opportunity to influence public thinking	0.20	0.13	0.28	0.20
Having a boss who appreciates what you do	0.48	0.57	0.72	0.59
Freedom from continual close supervision over your work	0.32	0.41	0.06	0.27
A job that makes the organization different in some ways because you work for it	0.44	0.57	0.06	0.36
Having an influence on important decisions	0.88	1.54	0.98	1.13
NON-PROFESSIONAL ITEMS				
Being able to enjoy what's involved in the job	0.60	1.00	0.83	0.80
Availability of support: working with people who will stand behind you	0.66	0.74	0.83	0.74
Working with people rather than things	-0.20	0.07	0.06	-0.03
Getting ahead in the organization you work for	0.58	1.15	1.15	0.95
Security of the job	-0.86	-0.22	0.34	-0.26
Salary: earning enough for a good living	0.26	0.80	0.94	0.66
Having a job with excitement and variety	0.00	0.39	0.70	0.36

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

NON-PROFESSIONAL ITEMS (cont.)	DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS OF ACTUAL-IDEAL PR JOBS HP (50)	MP (46)	LP (47)	TOTAL (143)
Having a job with prestige in the community	-0.18	0.17	0.23	0.07
Having a job my family is proud of	-0.52	-0.22	0.04	-0.24
A job that doesn't disrupt my family life	-0.16	-0.22	0.51	0.04
Being with people who are congenial	-0.36	0.24	0.04	-0.04
A job that brings me into contact with important people	-1.38	-0.46	-0.34	-0.74
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ITEMS				
Being asked to participate in decision making	0.48	1.20	0.68	0.78
A job where the PR function has the same status in the organization as the legal function	0.76	1.02	0.75	0.84
Being left alone to perform PR activities without constant supervision from management	0.20	0.50	0.45	0.38
Having management (or clients) who hold the PR function in high esteem	0.66	1.15	0.77	0.85
Being able to work in a climate of full, ideal and total social responsibility	0.18	0.50	-0.08	0.20
A job which requires one to be honest and ethical at all times	1.02	0.73	0.68	0.87
Freedom from supervision on daily duties	0.32	0.49	0.06	0.27
Working with people who respect you professionally	0.81	0.72	0.75	0.76
A job where PR people have a say in decision making	0.88	1.54	0.98	1.13

A positive figure indicates a high level of dissatisfaction; a negative figure represents relative satisfaction.

TABLE 2

PERCEIVED PR JOB SATISFACTION ACCORDING TO SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ORIENTATION

	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF ACTUAL-IDEAL PR JOBS			
PROFESSIONAL ITEMS	HiSR (n=42)	MdSR (n=53)	LoSR (n=48)	TOTAL (n=143)
Full use of abilities and training	1.07	1.02	1.15	1.08
Opportunity for originality and initiative	0.98	0.59	0.69	0.73
Getting ahead in your professional career	1.37	1.09	1.06	1.15
Working with a well known and respected organization	0.05	-0.38	-0.60	-0.33
Having a job that is valuable and essential to society	0.44	-0.04	-0.46	-0.04
Respect for ability and competence of co-workers	1.00	0.45	-0.04	0.45
Opportunity to have an influence on the public's thinking	0.27	0.21	0.15	0.20
Having a boss who appreciates what you do	1.15	0.64	0.06	0.59
Freedom from close supervision over your work	0.88	0.23	-0.23	0.27
A job that makes the organization different in some ways because you work for it	0.63	0.43	0.04	0.36
Having an influence on important decisions	1.44	1.08	0.92	1.13
Opportunity to learn new skills and knowledge	1.05	0.53	0.67	0.71
NON-PROFESSIONAL ITEMS				
Being able to enjoy the job	0.95	0.91	0.60	0.80
Availability of support; working with people who will stand behind you	1.12	0.75	0.42	0.74
Working with people rather than things	0.32	0.06	-0.40	-0.03
Getting ahead in the organization you work for	1.46	0.79	0.71	0.95
Security of the job	-0.37	0.02	-0.46	-0.26
Salary: earning enough money for a good living	0.90	0.60	0.50	0.66
Having a job with excitement and variety	0.73	0.38	0.04	0.36

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF ACTUAL-IDEAL PR JOBS			
NON-PROFESSIONAL ITEMS (cont.)	HiSR (42)	MdSR (53)	LoSR (48)	TOTAL (143)
Having a job with prestige in the community	0.46	0.13	-0.33	0.07
Having a job my family is proud of	0.24	-0.28	-0.60	-0.24
Having a job that does not disrupt my family life	0.24	0.06	-0.15	0.04
Being with people who are congenial to work with	0.44	0.02	-0.50	-0.04
A job that brings contact with important people	-0.09	-0.69	-1.35	-0.74
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY THEORY ITEMS				
Being asked to participate in decision making	1.37	0.77	0.29	0.78
A job where PR function has same status as the legal function	1.90	0.93	-0.15	0.84
Being left alone to carry out PR activities without constant supervision from management	1.00	0.36	-0.13	0.38
Having management (or clients) who hold the PR function in high esteem	1.51	0.81	0.35	0.85
Being able to work in a climate of full, ideal and total social responsibility	0.88	0.13	-0.31	0.20
A job which require honesty and ethics at all times	0.98	0.82	0.59	0.87
Freedom from close supervision over your work	0.88	0.23	-0.23	0.27
Working with management (or clients) who respect you professionally	0.68	0.78	0.82	0.76
A job where PR people have a decision making influence	1.44	1.08	0.92	1.13

A positive figure indicates a high level of dissatisfaction; a negative figure represents relative satisfaction.

TABLE 3

PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION AND THE PRESENT JOB SATISFACTION INDEX

INDEX ITEMS	PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION HP (n=50)	MP (n=46)	LP (n=47)	TOTAL (n=143)
How satisfied are you with your present job in PR?	5.58	5.35	5.45	5.46
How do you feel about prospects for the future with your present employer?	5.53	5.26	4.91	5.24
How satisfied are you with PR as a line of work?	5.66	5.54	5.79	5.66
How do you feel about prospects for your future in PR?	5.82	5.74	5.57	5.71
How do you feel about your knowledge and understanding of communication skills?	5.70	5.44	5.96	5.70
How do you feel about the prestige of being a PR practitioner?	4.94	5.09	5.21	5.08
How satisfied are you with your annual income?	5.10	4.72	4.75	4.86
How do you think your family feels about you being a PR person?	5.81	5.53	5.98	5.78
How do you feel about the opportunities for creativity and self expression on your present job?	5.80	5.09	5.68	5.53
How do you feel about the amount of supervision you receive?	5.53	5.11	5.77	5.48
How satisfied are you with the respect you now receive from your management (clients, boss, etc.)?	5.50	5.15	5.43	5.36
How satisfied are you about the role you play in decision making?	5.34	4.80	4.94	5.04

Responses ranged from a 1 for "extremely unsatisfied" to a 7 for "extremely satisfied."

TABLE 4

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ORIENTATION AND THE PRESENT JOB SATISFACTION INDEX

INDEX ITEMS	SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ORIENTATION HiSR (n=42)	MdSR (n=53)	LoSR (n=48)	TOTAL (n=143)
How satisfied are you with your present job?	5.61	5.49	5.29	5.46
How do you feel about prospects for the future with your present employer?	5.55	5.19	5.02	5.24
How satisfied are you with PR as a line of work?	5.88	5.94	5.15	5.66
How do you feel about prospects for your future in PR?	6.03	5.76	5.40	5.71
How do you feel about your knowledge and understanding of communication skills?	5.71	5.81	5.56	5.70
How do you feel about the prestige of being a PR practitioner?	5.59	5.28	5.44	5.08
How satisfied are you with your annual income?	4.88	4.93	4.75	4.86
How do you think your family feels about you being a PR person?	5.90	5.92	5.48	5.78
How do you feel about the opportunities for creativity and self expression on your present job?	5.71	5.55	5.33	5.53
How do you feel about the amount of supervision you receive?	5.29	5.62	5.45	5.48
How satisfied are you with the respect you now receive from your management (clients, boss, etc.)?	5.32	5.55	5.21	5.36
How satisfied are you about the role you play in decision making?	5.10	5.19	4.81	5.04

Responses ranged from a 1 for "extremely unsatisfied" to a 7 for "extremely satisfied."

PROFESSIONAL IMPLEMENTATION SCORES ACCORDING TO PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION

PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT ITEMS	HP (n=50)	MP (n=46)	LP (n=47)	TOTAL (n=143)
PR people should strive to be accurate and honest always.	6.71	6.73	6.54	6.66
If a PR person acts in an unprofessional manner he/she should be disciplined by his/her peers.	5.42	5.29	5.33	5.35
PRSA accreditation is raising the level of professionalism in public relations.	4.22	4.40	4.54	4.39
Public relations work provides a satisfying life.	5.73	5.49	5.50	5.58
Professional control and regulation is necessary to keep the "flacks and drummers" out of PR, and PR people should license themselves in a manner similar to other professions.	4.27	4.53	4.80	4.53
Universities should offer course work in PR.	5.90	6.11	6.22	6.07
PR majors should take business courses.	6.33	6.29	6.20	6.27
Business majors should take PR courses.	5.94	5.78	5.83	5.85
Advertising is one function within the overall PR process.	6.00	5.62	5.78	5.81
Periodic institutes or refresher courses should be offered at universities where working PR people could study areas such as public opinion, management, contemporary PR problems, etc.	6.04	6.18	6.07	6.09

Responses ranged from a 1 for "disagree extremely strongly" to a 7 for "agree extremely strongly."

TABLE 6

PROFESSIONAL IMPLEMENTATION SCORES ACCORDING TO SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ORENTIATION

PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT ITEMS	HiSR (n=42)	MdSR (n=53)	LoSR (n=48)	TOTAL (n=143)
PR people should strive to be accurate and honest always.	6.85	6.62	6.54	6.66
If a PR person acts in an unprofessional manner he/she should be disciplined by his/her peers.	5.95	5.24	4.94	5.35
PRSA accreditation is raising the level of professionalism in public relations.	4.59	4.57	4.02	4.39
Public relations work provides a satisfying life.	6.00	5.56	5.23	5.58
Professional control and regulation is necessary to keep the "flacks and drummers" out of PR, and PR people should license themselves in a manner similar to other professions.	4.85	4.69	4.08	4.53
Universities should offer course work in PR.	6.44	5.98	5.85	6.07
PR majors should take business courses.	6.54	6.22	6.10	6.27
Business majors should take PR courses.	6.20	5.77	5.65	5.85
Advertising is one function within the overall PR process.	5.98	6.02	5.44	5.81
Periodic institutes or refresher courses should be offered at universities where working PR people could study areas such as public opinion, management, contemporary PR problems, etc.	6.66	6.02	5.69	6.09

Responses ranged from a 1 for "disagree extremely strongly" to a 7 for "agree extremely strongly."

TABLE 7

PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS AT VARIOUS LEVELS
OF PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ORIENTATION

	HIGH SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (n=42)	MEDIUM SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (n=53)	LOW SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (n=48)	
HIGH PROFESSIONALS (n=50)	15 (10.4%)	17 (11.9%)	18 (12.6%)	50 (35.0%)
MEDIUM PROFESSIONALS (n=46)	18 (12.6%)	12 (8.4%)	16 (11.2%)	46 (32.2%)
LOW PROFESSIONALS (n=47)	9 (6.3%)	24 (16.8%)	14 (9.8%)	47 (32.9%)
	42 (29.4%)	53 (37.1%)	48 (33.6%)	143 (100%)

(X^2=7.60, p=.11, df=4)

TABLE 8
EDUCATION LEVELS ACCORDING TO PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ORIENTATION

	Professional Orientation				Social Responsibility Orientation		
EDUCATION RECEIVED	HP (n=50)	MP (n=46)	LP (n=47)	TOTAL (n=143)	HiSR (n=42)	MdSR (n=53)	LoSR (n=48)
Graduate-level degree	18.0%	26.1%	12.8%	18.8%	29.3%	9.4%	20.8%
Degree in "communication"	50.0%	41.3%	55.3%	49.0%	43.9%	54.7%	47.9%
General University degree	16.0%	15.2%	19.1%	16.8%	12.2%	18.9%	16.7%
Junior College diploma	2.0%	4.3%	4.3%	2.5%	4.9%	5.7%	0.0%
Some college or university	10.0%	27.3%	27.3%	7.7%	7.3%	7.5%	8.3%
High school grad or less	4.0%	6.5%	2.1%	4.2%	2.4%	3.8%	4.2%

TABLE 9
INCOME ACCORDING TO PROFESSIONAL AND SR ORIENTATION

INCOME							
More than $50,000	6.2%	4.4%	2.1%	4.2%	7.3%	1.9%	4.2%
$35,001 to $50,000	6.0%	20.0%	10.6%	12.0%	4.9%	13.5%	16.7%
$25,001 to $35,000	32.0%	15.6%	31.9%	26.8%	31.7%	25.0%	25.0%
$20,001 to $25,000	24.0%	13.3%	21.3%	19.7%	19.5%	30.8%	8.3%
$12,001 to $20,000	20.0%	33.3%	19.2%	24.0%	24.4%	15.4%	21.3%
$12,000 or less	12.0%	13.3%	14.9%	13.4%	12.2%	13.5%	14.6%

FOOTNOTES

[1]Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations, 4th ed., (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 71-73.

[2]David Finn, "Modifying Opinions in the New Human Climate," Public Relations Quarterly, (Fall, 1972), pp. 12-15 and 26-27.

[3]Arlene Hershman, "Public Relations Goes Public," Dun's Review (September, 1977), pp. 62-66.

[4]H. Frazier Moore and Bertrand R. Canfield, Public Relations: Principles, Cases, and Problems, 7th ed., (Homewood, Ill.: Irwin, 1977), pp. 467-468.

[5]Frank W. Wylie, remarks to the Southeast Public Relations Institute, Athens, Georgia, October 14, 1977.

[6]Doug Newsom, "Inner Circle Vision: A Concept of Professionalism in Public Relations." Paper presented to the Educators' Dialogue, Public Relations Society of America Convention, San Diego, California, November 16, 1977.

[7]John J. Corson and George A. Steiner, Measuring Business's Social Performance: The Corporate Social Audit (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1974), pp. 1-3.

[8]International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, (New York: Macmillan Co. and The Free Press, 1968), Vol. 8, p. 536.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Morris L. Cogan, "The Problem of Defining a Profession," Annals of the American Academy of Political Science, (January, 1955), p. 105.

[11]For information about these criteria see: A.M. Carr-Saunders, "Professionalization in Historical Perspective," in Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills, eds., Professionalization (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966); A.M. Carr-Saunders and P.A. Wilson, The Professions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933); Everett C. Hughes, "The Professions," in Kenneth S. Lynn, ed., The Professions in America (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965): Morris L. Cogan, "Towards a Definition of Profession," Harvard Educational Review, (Winter, 1953), and Amitai Etzioni, ed., The Semi-Professions and Their Organization (New York: Free Press, 1969).

[12]Edward Engberg, "Can the Professions Save Us?" The Center Magazine, (November, 1968), pp. 5-8.

[13]Cogan, op. cit., pp. 105-108.

[14]Engberg, loc. cit.

[15]Morris L. Cogan, "Towards a Definition of Profession," Harvard Educational Review, (Winter, 1953), pp. 33-50.

[16]Blaine K. McKee, Oguz B. Nayman and Dan L. Lattimore, "How PR People See Themselves," Public Relations Journal, (November, 1975), pp. 47-52.

[17]Ibid., p. 51.

[18]Oguz B. Nayman, Blaine K. McKee and Dan L. Lattimore, "PR Personnel and Print Journalists: A Comparison of Professionalism," Journalism Quarterly (Autumn, 1977), pp. 492-497.

[19]Ibid.

[20]James E. Grunig, "Organizations and Public Relations: Testing a Communication Theory," Journalism Monographs, No. 46 (November, 1976), p. 30.

[21]Philip Lesly, Lesly's Public Relations Handbook (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 522-524.

[22]Cutlip and Center, op. cit., p. 659.

[23]Moore and Canfield, op. cit., p. 18.

[24]Doug Newsom and Alan Scott, This is PR: The Realities of Public Relations (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1976), pp. 174-186.

[25]Charles S. Steinberg, The Creation of Consent: Public Relations in Practice (New York: Hastings House, 1975), pp. 77-78.

[26]Cutlip and Center, op. cit., p. 667.

[27]Mike Ranney, "Save Us From Professionalism," Public Relations Journal (June, 1977), pp. 27-28.

[28]Mary Fenton, "More on Professionalism," Public Relations Journal (August, 1977), p. 16.

[29]Cutlip and Center, op. cit., p. 668.

[30]Donald K. Wright, "Social Responsibility in Public Relations: A Multi-Step Theory," Public Relations Review (Fall, 1976), pp. 24-36.

[31]George C.S. Benson, "Business Ethics in American Society," Journal of Contemporary Business (Summer, 1975), pp. 59-87.

[32]Richard W. Darrow, "American Attitudes Toward Big Business," in Hill and Knowlton Executives, eds., Critical Issues in Public Relations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975), pp. 1-11.

[33]Raymond Simon, Public Relations Concepts and Practice (Columbus, Ohio: Grid, 1976), pp. 58-61.

[34]Milton Friedman, "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Its Profits," in "The Sunday Times Magazine," New York Times, (September 13, 1970), pp. 32-33.

[35]Milton Friedman, "Social Responsibility and Corporate Policy Making," in Edward J. Blander, ed., The Corporation in a Democratic Society (New York: Wilson, 1975), pp. 43-45.

[36]John Maynard Keynes, The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1936), pp. 46-51.

[37]John Kenneth Galbraith, The Affluent Society, 3rd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976), pp. 162-163. For additional information see, Eli Goldston, "Corporate Social Responsibility and Management Behavior," Journal of Contemporary Business (Winter, 1973), pp. 63-76.

[38]Committee for Economic Development, The Changing Social Contract With Business, (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1971), Chapter 1, "Social Responsibilities of Business Corporations."

[39]Moore and Canfield, op. cit., pp. 467-468.

[40]Simon, op. cit. p. 61.

[41]Don Votow, "The Nature of Social Responsibility: You Can't Get There From Here," Journal of Contemporary Business (Winter, 1973), pp. 1-20.

[42]Wright, loc. cit.

[43]David Finn, "Struggle for Ethics in Public Relations," Harvard Business Review (January-February, 1959), pp. 9-11.

[44]Craig Aronoff, "Credibility of Public Relations for Journalists," Public Relations Review (Fall, 1975), pp. 45-56.

[45]Frank Wylie, "Survey Shows Ethics Code Needed for Newsmen Dealing With PR People," PR Reporter (December 10, 1973), pp. 1-4.

[46]Carl Rowan, "U.S. Constitution Includes Nazis," Atlanta Constitution (February 17, 1978), p. 4A.

[47]Wright, loc. cit.

[48]Hugh M. Culberson, "Public Relations EThics: A New Look," Public Relations Quarterly (Winter, 1973), pp. 15-17 and 23-25.

[49]See, Dennis W. Jeffers, "Performance Expectations as a Measure of Relative Status of News and PR People," Journalism Quarterly (Summer, 1977), pp. 299-306; and Craig E. Aronoff, "Predictors of Success in Placing Releases in Newspapers," Public Relations Review (Winter, 1976), pp. 43-57.

[50]For a review of this research see, Oguz B. Nayman, "Professional Orientations of Journalists: An Introduction to Communicator Analysis Studies," Gazette (Vol. 19, 1973), pp. 195-212.

[51]For information see Merrill Samuelson, "A Standardized Test to Measure Job Satisfaction in the Newsroom," Journalism Quarterly (Summer, 1962), pp. 285-291.

[52]Abraham Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science (San Francisco: Chandler, 1964), p. 305.

[53]Wright, op. cit.

[54]Walt Seifert, "Our Highest Court: Public Opinion," Public Relations Journal (December, 1977), pp. 24-25.

[55]Scott M. Cutlip, conversation, Athens, Georgia, March 2, 1978.